UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|----------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/564,368 | 01/12/2006 | Atsushi Yamagishi | 284112US0PCT | 7782 |
| | 7590 04/24/200 AK, MCCLELLAND 1 | EXAMINER | | |
| 1940 DUKE STREET | | | SUTTON, DARRYL C | |
| ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | 1612 | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 04/24/2009 | ELECTRONIC |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|-----------------|------------------|--|--|
| 10/564,368 | YAMAGISHI ET AL. | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | | |
| | | | |

| | DARRYL C. SUTTON | 1612 | |
|---|--|---|---|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app | ears on the cover sheet with the | correspondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>26 February 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS | APPLICATION IN CONDITION F | OR ALLOWANCE. | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Application for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 periods: | n the same day as filing a Notice o replies: (1) an amendment, affida peal (with appeal fee) in compliance | f Appeal. To avoid abar vit, or other evidence, w e with 37 CFR 41.31; or | which places the (3) a Request |
| a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this a | | h in the final rejection, whi | chever is later. In |
| no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or | (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN TH | • | |
| MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) | e on which the petition under 37 CFR 1 ktension and the corresponding amoun shortened statutory period for reply or r than three months after the mailing d | t of the fee. The appropria ginally set in the final Offic | ate extension fee be action; or (2) as |
| NOTICE OF APPEAL | " " 07.050.44.07 | en 1 2012 a a | 6.1 1.4 6 |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comfiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed value. AMENDMENTS | ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), | to avoid dismissal of the | |
| 3. X The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, | but prior to the date of filing a brie | f, will <u>not</u> be entered be | cause |
| (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co | | | |
| (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below | • | | |
| (c) ☑ They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or | | | ne issues for |
| (d)⊠ They present additional claims without canceling a | | jected claims. | |
| NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1. | * ** | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 | | ompliant Amendment (I | PTOL-324). |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s | | | |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). | | | _ |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proof the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | ill be entered and an ex | kplanation of |
| Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to Claim(s) rejected: <u>2,3 and 5-21</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | |
| 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessal | overcome <u>all</u> rejections under app | eal and/or appellant fails | s to provide a |
| 10. ☑ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | on of the status of the claims after | entry is below or attach | ed. |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by Applicant's arguments that the newly amended claims a non-entry of the proposed amendment | | | |
| 12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). 13. ☐ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>. | (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). | | |
| /Frederick Krass/ | /D 1000 :: : | | |
| Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1612 | /Darryl C Sutton/ Examiner, Art Unit 161 | 2 | |
| | | | |

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Application No.

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant has amended claims 6 and 8 to include the limitation of "inorganic fluoride" which would require further search and/or consideration to determine whether inorganic fluorides would be obvious over "fluorine ion supplying compounds" more generally, as disclosed in the prior art. Applicant has also amended claim 8 and 9 to include the limitation "calcium salt of an polyol phosphate". Further consideration would be required to determine if calcium salts of polyol phosphates are obvious over the calcium salts of organic acids of the prior art.

.

Continuation of 13. Other: Applicant has submitted an affidavit to substantiate the allegation of unexpected results. The Examiner has considered the affidavit and it is not found to be persuasive. Applicant directs the Examiner to Table 1 for a showing of superior fluoride uptake. Table 1 does not probatively show the claimed superior fluoride uptake because the experimental design does not compare equivalent compositions. Applicant has compared an example from the Winston et al. prior art alone to compositions of the instant invention. Winston et al. teach, however, that monofluorophosphate can be incorporated into the second component with the calcium compound and therefore comparisons to compostions that do contain monofluorophosphate within the calcium component would have been more representative of the closest prior art. The rejections of claims 2,3 and 5-21 are maintained.